

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated January 5, 2011, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-47 and 49-54 were previously pending in this application. Claims 31 and 49 have been amended. No claims have canceled or added. As a result, claims 1-47 and 49-54 are pending for examination with claims 1, 31, and 49 being independent. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office Action rejected claim 49 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as purportedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

At page 3, the Office Action states that “Claim 49 recites ‘A computer readable medium’ which is disclosed neither in the specification nor in the original claims. Therefore, it is considered new matter.” The Applicants respectfully disagree. Contrary to the Office Action’s statement, claim 49 recites “A computer readable **storage device**.” The present application provides support for a computer readable storage device at least at page 5, lines 25-26 of the application as filed, which states that a first signal may be processed depending on a set of instructions stored in a memory. Memory is an example of a computer readable storage device. Therefore, the term “computer readable storage device” is supported by the application as filed. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 49 under 35 U.S.C. §112 is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Office Action rejected claim 49 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as purportedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

At page 3, the Office Action states that “Claim 49 recites ‘A computer readable medium’ which can include the non-statutory subject matter – transitory medium such as signal.” Contrary to the statement in the Office Action, claim 49 recites “a computer readable storage device.” Since claim 49 recites a storage device, i.e., an apparatus, claim 49 recites statutory subject matter. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejected 1-11, 14-23, 27, 31-41, 43-45, 49, 51 and 53-54 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over Hashimoto, U.S. Patent No. 5,646,688 (“Hashimoto”) in view of Ryan, U.S. Patent No. 6,263,019 (“Ryan”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Hashimoto describes a video data processing system 10 that has a first substrate 12 and a second substrate 14. The first substrate has a system decoder 16, an input buffer 18, parser 20, dequantization unit 22, and transformation unit 24. Motion vectors are provided by parser 20 to the motion compensation modules 26a and 26b on a second substrate. The data from transformation unit 24 is also provided to the second substrate (Abstract, FIG. 1).

Ryan describes an apparatus comprising a state machine for parsing header information in a digitally encoded signal. The state machine defines states corresponding to discrete parsing operations. Each state is associated with a processing time set by a microprocessor. These processing times may be changed based on image content or to accommodate changes in the circuitry to implement the state machine. The state machine decodes MPEG-2 encoded image data (col. 1 lines 65 – col. 2 line 18).

By contrast, independent claim 1 recites a video decoding circuit comprising, *inter alia*, a second video data processor comprising a predictor constructor, said second video data processor is arranged to receive at least a part of said second signal, process said at least a part of said second signal to provide a third signal, and output said third signal, *said second and third signals comprising a decoded video image stream wherein a part of said second signal comprises a picture level parameter word which comprises coding standard information*, said coding standard information defining variations in the type of data (emphasis added).

Hashimoto and Ryan, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least the above element of claim 1.

The Office Action concedes that “Hashimoto is silent on wherein a part of said second signal comprises a picture level parameter word which comprises coding standard information,” (Office Action, page 5). However, the Office Action states that Ryan purportedly cures this deficiency of Hashimoto because “Ryan discloses wherein a part of said second signal comprises a picture level parameter word (picture layer of syntax are parsed by Microprocessor, col. 5, line 46-48) which comprises coding standard information (MPEG 2 syntax, col. 5, line 46-48)”

(Office Action, page 5). Applicants respectfully disagree because the cited portion of Ryan fails to disclose a picture level parameter word which comprises coding standard information, as recited in claim 1. Rather, the relied-upon portion of Ryan describes a “picture layer of syntax.” However, syntax is not a word, but rather an abstraction that may define a format for organizing information. For example, the Merriam-Webster Dictionary provides a definition of syntax as “2) : a connected or orderly system : harmonious arrangement of parts or elements.” Although Ryan describes the use of syntax for organizing data, the organization of the data does not identify the content of the data and does not suggest the presence of a “picture level parameter word which comprises coding standard information,” as recited in claim 1. The Office Action has not identified any portion of Ryan that discloses coding standard information present within a picture level parameter word. Ryan fails to disclose any picture level parameter word which comprises coding standard information. Therefore, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Hashimoto and Ryan. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 2-30 and 50-53 depend from claim 1 and patentably distinguish over Hashimoto and Ryan for at least the same reasons.

Claim 31, as amended, recites a video decoding method comprising a step of outputting said second signal, wherein said step of outputting said second signal comprises the step of outputting a parameter word which comprises coding standard information, the coding standard information defining variations in the type of data, and said step of processing said at least part of said second signal is dependent on the format of the video data received. As should be appreciated from the above discussion, Hashimoto and Ryan, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or to suggest that outputting the second signal comprises outputting a parameter word which comprises coding standard information. Therefore, claim 31 patentably distinguishes over Hashimoto and Ryan. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 32-47 and 54 depend from claim 31 and patentably distinguish over Hashimoto and Ryan for at least the same reasons.

Claim 49, as amended, recites a computer readable storage device comprising computer readable instructions, which, when executed by a processor, carry out a video decoding method wherein a step of outputting said second signal comprises the step of outputting a parameter

word which comprises coding standard information. As should be appreciated from the above discussion, Hashimoto and Ryan, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or to suggest that outputting the second signal comprises outputting a parameter word which comprises coding standard information. Therefore, claim 49 patentably distinguishes over Hashimoto and Ryan. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 49 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

General Comments on Dependent Claims

Because each of the dependent claims depends from a base claim that is believed to be in condition for allowance, Applicants believe that it is unnecessary at this time to argue the further distinguishing features of all of the dependent claims. However, Applicants do not necessarily concur with the interpretation of the dependent claims as set forth in the Office Action, nor do Applicants concur that the basis for the rejection of any of the dependent claims is proper. Therefore, Applicants reserve the right to specifically address in the future the further patentability of the dependent claims.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' representative at the telephone number indicated below to discuss any outstanding issues relating to the allowability of the application.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825 under Docket No. S1022.71096US00 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: April 5, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Robert A. Jensen, Reg. No.: 61,146
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
Tel: 617.646.8000